5715

THE GITA AND BEYOND

For favour of Review in
"Anandavarta"

LIBRARY
No.........5715
Shri Shri Ma Anandamayee Ashram
BANARAS

By

NAGENDRA NATH CHANDA

Price Rupee one

AVAILABLE AT

619, TIMARPUR, DELHI 7, INDIA

CONTENTS.

PAGE

1ST CHAPTER—General Survey. 1

2ND CHAPTER—God and Soul. 4

3RD CHAPTER—Cosmogony or Creation. 9

4TH CHAPTER—Mukti or Salvation. 13

5TH CHAPTER—Side Issues. 16

6TH CHAPTER—Omissions and Commissions. 21

7TH CHAPTER—Raja Yoga or Absolutisation. 25

8TH CHAPTER—Path of Jnana or Reasoning. 31

9TH CHAPTER—Path of Bhakti or Adoration. 36

10TH CHAPTER—Path of Karma or Activity. 41

PREFACE

This booklet is not simply a criticism of the Gita (the famous Hindu treatise) but goes beyond. It gives deeper spiritual truths (beyond science) as revealed by Yogic realisations. In the light of that it clears various fallacies (eastern and western) about the mystery of God and man and this world and suggests new expedient approaches for peace in life and conquest of death. These are published for the service of humanity.

Timarpur, Delhi
August 30, 1970.

LIBRARY
No.......5715
Shri Shri Ma Anandamayee Ashram
BANARAS

1st Chapter

GENERAL SURVEY

1. In the spiritual thought of India the Gita marks the transition from the Upanishadic phase to the Puranic phase. Of the four aspects of conventional religions, namely rituals, mythology, morals and philosophy, the Purnas bear the last three in abundance. The Gita falls in line with them. The Gita is essentially a Krishna Puran with an Upanishadic tinge. In this connection the naming of the Gita as "Bhagavat Gita Upanishad" is significant. The Gita (which is in Paninian Sanskrit) and Brahma Sutra quote each other. As such the time of the Gita might be round about the Christian era, the beginning of the Puranic age ? The Gita might have been squeezed into the Mahabharata (Vishma Parva) for popularisation. Some interpolation might have occurred in the body of the Gita again. There are two other Gitas (Anu Gita and Brahma Gita) in the Mahabharata, but they are not so rich and luxuriant.

However Vyasa, the original author of the Mahabharata is known as the author of the Gita verse (both Krishna and Arjun speak in verse) whence the name Vaiasika Sanhita. See Sloka 75/18. Vyasa is himself mentioned as a Rishi (though he is not as great as his son Suk or Vrigu—25/10) in the Gita (13, 37/10). Vyasa is also the author of Bhagavat which historians however hold to be a south Indian production of the 10th century only. If the author of the Brahma Sutra and the Gita be the same Vyasa, one must be held as the modification of the other. Be it as it may. Leaving this historicity let us now turn to the contents of the Gita.

2. The Gita seems to have been written out of four fundamental aims and situations (1) Supplying in that transitional period a simple creed of Bhakti and Krama for the householder (2) Establishing politician Krishna (son of maternal uncle of Arjun) as the new manifest God or Avatar (3) Impossibility of altogether ignoring Yoga and Jnana espoused by the Upanishads (4) Effecting a synthesis of the four spiritual paths

under the throne of Bhakti. Viewed apart from the Mahabharata, the Gita is a booklet of 700 Slokas in 18 Chapters. The first chapter is introduction of the dramatic context, the 2nd is a rough Jnana-centric summary of the whole book. Chapters 3 to 15 splash Karma, Bhakti, Jnana, Yoga etc. all of which have been said to be capable of giving salvation (25/13). Chapters 16 and 17 are dispensable extensions of the whole book, while the 18th chapter is very miscellaneous.

3. The Gita has freely borrowed from the Upanishads (which are acknowledged to be the milch-cow of the Gita milk) and the organised thoughts of philosophy. Like Swateswatar Upanishad the Gita has been an electic compilation from various Upanishads (say Gita's Kshar and Kshetrajna, or Gita's 19-20/2 couplets which are from Kathopanishad) many of which are conflicting. Like the Kena Upanishad the Gita contains a tinge of Sankhya, Vedanta and Yoga, but like Manusanhita and Mahabharata here Sankhya of Kapila (son of Kardama and Devahuti) is more in evidence than Vedanta with Maya. (Digga Nikaya of Buddhism speaks of not six but of 62 schools of Hindu philosophy. But all Hindu philosophy (unlike western philosophy) has the practical aim of salvation.) Admissions of the authorities of others are also copious. Couplets 16/2, 5/13, 3/18 of the Gita cite Rishis as authority while 13, 19/18 cite Sankhya and 21/8, 24/16 cite Vedas or Shastras as authority. These scholastic compilations and citations detract away from the authoritative stamp that was sought to be given through Krishna. In many cases these have proved to be only undigested adoptions.

4. Gita's thesis in short is that God who has incarnated himself as Krishna evolved this world through His own power of Prakriti and man's salvation lies in worship of Krishna. The whole texture has been woven round the Krishna cult of the Puranic age, worship of other Gods being held improper worship (23/9). In a round about way this prejudices the worship of Rama, Shiva, Kali, Allah, God etc. and the practices of Yoga, Jnana etc. This is narrow sectarianism.

Worship of the Manifest has been preferred to the worship of the Non-manifest because it is easier for the householder (5/12) for whom the Gita seems to have been primarily intended. As a part of the Vedas (Sruti) Upanishads are prohibited to the

Sudras and women, but not so is the Gita which is a Smriti (though the Gita is a free copy of the Upanishads).

5. At that time of the four Ashrams liberation was generally held to be attainable through asceticism and renunciation of society and activity only as the Aranyakas go to hint. But in the Gita by emphasis on selfless work and devotion to personal God (jointly rather than severally) Mukti has been sought to be brought to the easier reach of the ordinary householder, renunciation of all work being impossible (11/18). In this the Gita has the support of the Isa Upanishad which asks people to lead a selfless life living in society without renouncing it. But for Brahma realisation renunciation of society also has been supported (51-53/18).

In the attainment of emancipation the Upanishads mainly depend on Jnana. That importance of Jnana in liberation has not been relaxed here but it has been held that it comes to Karmis (38/4) and Bhaktas (11/10) through grace of God. The Gita has merely trified with Yoga.

6. But on the point of relative merit of the four Paths the Gita is very often contradictory. In fact the great disease of the Gita is that when speaking of a particular practice path it has the tendency of crowning it above all often with enough fallacy of Ignoratio Elenchi.

Sometimes in the Upanishadic trend Jnana or knowledge has been preferred to Karma or Bhakti (37-38/4, 2-17/5, 18/7). In 18/7 it has been held that the *Jnani is God himself*, while Bhaktas and Karmis are only God's own man (14-16/12). By couplets 27-28/5 the Yogi is said to be liberated in this very life (Jivanmukta). But if Jnani has been held superior (2/9) Bhakta of Manifest God also has been so preferreed (1-5/12). In most of the places by and large it is Bhakti that has been given the palm (47/6, 32/9, 54/11, 2/12, 66/18). In 12/12 and 46/6 drawing a merit list of the paths, the first place has been given to Nishkam Karma which is saturated with Bhakti, the second to Yoga and the third to Jnana. Elsewhere specifically also Bhakti has been given greater value than Raja Yoga and that after high appreciation of Raja Yoga itself (30/4, 28/5, 25-28, 40-46/6, 53/18). While the Gita is so Bhakticentric Yogavasistha later built round the earlier Avatar Rama is more Jnanacentric.

7. But to individuals the suitability of any of these paths depends on personal temperaments which the Gita also has indirectly recognised in one place (3/3). Bhakti is suitable for emotional ones and Jnana and Yoga for the inquisitive and the abstameous. But for full redemption the aspirants of all these paths have ultimately to pass to monistic universality to the cessation of individual personality and rebirth (see para 32).

The Gita has a reformist zeal as well. On the whole the Gita lifts the ban on Sudras and women (32/9) and does a social justice. And like the Maitryana Upanishad the Gita holds that the attached mind brings bondage and the detached mind brings salvation irrespective of caste or sex. To the shock of those who denounce Buddha for denouncing the Vedic sacrifices, the Gita in no uncertain terms denounces the Vedic rites (45/2, 20-21/9)

8. But this reformist spirit does not go far in the practical field. Against the above there are injunctions of observing the scriptures (24/16), scriptures being ignorable by the Jnanis only (46/2). The Gita supports the birth-ridden caste system (13/4, 45/18) with imperatives against hybridisation (43/1) of castes. (In the Purusha Sukta of Rig Veda also there is a saga of caste creation. Of the Varnashram system the Varnas or castes still subsist without former occupations or occupational qualifications, but not the difficult Ashrams). The crusade against the sacraments of the Vedas is not also very thorough. From Vedic worship of Nature Spirit, the Gita has turned to man worship as Avatar. In several places there is even open support of Yagna or oblation ceremony (11-13, 23/17, 5/18). In 6/18 Nishkam Yagna has no doubt been prescribed, but the object of such sacrifice is difficult to discern unless it be construed as a purposive prayer. A Madanmisraic stand on rituals is hardly tenable.

2ND CHAPTER

GOD AND SOUL

9. Now let us turn to the important theory of God-head in the Gita. According to the Gita the original world force is not gross and unconscious as in western theory of evolution, but subtle and conscious and the process of world formation

is not evolutionary but devolutionary practically. For while the western evolution theory holds that matter has evolved into life and mind, like all Hindu scriptures the Gita holds that universal consciousness has devolved into life and matter (1-2/15). Though this Becoming is vicarious through the projected mind still it is centrifugal.

But on God theory and other connected adjuncts of creation, liberation etc. the Gita has made a mess of contradictory propositions. The attributed outside God of Bhakti and the passive inside Purusha of Sankhya have both been haphazardly adopted without apt synthesis. The synthesis of couplets 8/9 and 9/9 is funny enough.

10. Naisadia Sukta of Rig Veda holds that the root cause of this world tree is up in the Nonmanifest. Following it the Gita also says that the world is held by a part of God (42/10). In the Gita God has been said to be the shelter and source of the manifest and the nonmanifest alike (29/5, 6/7, 18/9, 3-38/11), but again God is also said to be (12/7, 5/9) nonexistent in things. God is also alleged to be appearing divided in things and persons (16/13) and significantly elsewhere this apparent division of God is said to be due to distracting Raja attribute (21/18).

11. Thus about Godhood apparently there is a maze of Ayes and Noes. Sometimes God is the inactive Nonmanifest [this is said to be (24/7, 21/8, 18/15) His best state] with creation left to Prakriti, sometimes He is Himself the creator and destroyer of the world, sometimes He is identical with the world itself and to complete the pendimonium sometimes in the Vedantic way the world is said to be Mayic and not created really (14, 25/7). The gross existent and the fine non-existent have also been commonly held to be God (19-20/10). This is an offer of full connotation of God in some cases, but a myopic contradiction also in others (see para 16).

It is interesting that the Taoistic Philosophy of China also holds—"That then which engenders all things is itself unengendered ; that by which all things are evolved is itself untouched by evolution. Self-engendered and selfevolved it has in itself the elements of substance, appearances, wisdom, strength, dispersion and cessation. Yet it would be a mistake to call it by any one of these names." Is not this a rough conception of Sagun Brahman ?

12. The Gita presents a picture of plurality of Godhead. In couplets 18-20/8 Brahma, Avyakta and Super-nonmanifest (Purushottam) have been vouched for. Differently slokas 37/II and 18/15 also speak of the Manifest, the Nonmanifest and an Overlord. It has been upheld that Purushottam is separate from (37/II 13/13) Ksar or individual and Aksar or universal (20/8, 18/15). Thus practically three divinites have been vouched for though sloka 37/II comprehends these three into one also.

13. Indian pluralism is not in 33 Vedic forms of the same God but really in the above. Like the Gita the verse Upanishads also swear by a God between the World Soul (Hiranyagarva) and Individual Soul. But Yogis speak of only three roles of the same God, the Nonmanifest, the Uiversal and the Individual (see paras 16 and 20). To Yogis mind or Prakriti is not separate but is only a ray of the so called Individual Soul. Yogis go from the Individual stage to the Nonmanifest stage through the Universal stage without any gap or stop any where. This shows that the difference of these three stages is only functional and not personal. The mind projecting Individual Soul might have been deemed as a separate creating God. This explains the anomaly of the above three—God theory. The same God being creating and noncreating in different stages is not mere abracadabra. It is like potential energy becoming kinetic energy. This will show how difficult it is to convey the full idea of God even by the word Satchidananda or Isness, Consciousness and Bliss.

14. The Gita holds that the heat of fire, Sun and hunger is God's heat (12-15/15). This is comparable with the observation of Swataswatar Upanishad that God has spun this world like a spider with substance brought out from his own being and covered himself therewith and that God lies hidden in the body of all creatures. That these bodies are Mayic is not borne out by this. The Atharva Veda has the saga of Swan or Brahman (which is invoked as Om Tat Sat 23/17) having one foot in the stream of immanence and the other in transcendence. This however is really monism and not pluralism.

15. Barring a few instances (25/7, 61/18) most often in the general Upanishadic trend (though Kaivalya Upanishad has its Tattwamasi theory) the universe has been held to be not Maya or illusion but real. Here Yogic experience gives the picture of the emperical world being a true mental obsession (see para 40) which goes on thinning or thickening with higher

or lower tendency of the mind. So in this light the more correct position would be not Shankar's one that "Brahman is true, the world is false and man is nothing but Brahman" but one that "Brahman is true, the world is relatively true (as an impermanent mental projection of Brahman) and the real man is nothing but Brahman." As the husk of the paddy is real in some sense though it is not the real rice, so the human mind is relatively real though it is not the potent Soul. Without the mind there would have been no man, manhood being a partnership of Soul and mind. But in the extramental plane the Yogi of course does not perceive these mental objects and personalities.

16. To man the more important problem is God-man or Soul-man relationship, in Yogic parlance the Soul taking the place of God of Bhakti. (The Soul form of the Supreme seems to be more tangible (24/13), though the outside world does not know of it so much.) But in God-man theory also the Gita is not free from prevarications. Somewhere it has been said that Brahman is neither Sat or Is nor Asat or Is-Not (12/13). Brahman has also been held to be the rearer of all attributes though himself unattributed (15-17/13) and the producer of attributes without being controlled by them (12/7). Then while affirming that God is free from passion and unrighteousness it has been contended that good and evil come from God (4-5/10). There is evidently no rationalisation and adjustment here.

Now let Gita's Soul-man relationship be also noticed. (Western philosophy has defined Soul as "the plurality of psychical instances comprehended into a unity of consciousness." This seems to be the definition of the outwardly perceptible mental ego only. But in Indian philosophy Soul (which in itself is a super feeling) is the supreme immotal universal incorporal power both passive and active and in and out of man. According to Yogic perception (see pará 34), the Soul has three functional stages—Individual, Universal and Nonmanifest. The so called Individual Soul by Its own will and spur is perceived to rise to the other two higher stages. In Its Individual stage the Soul seems limited and unscattering like the mild morning Sun, in the next Universal stage it appears all scattering like the mid-day Sun and finally in the Nonmanifest stage It becomes unperceptible like the sunken Sun. In Its Nonmanifest void stage It sheds attributes and becomes inactive. It assumes attributes in Its Universal and Individual stages.

In the Universal stage Soul's attributes go on opening and deepening (like layers of onion). But at that stage despite these wonderful attributes there is no creation and hence any world sense. So called creation through the projected mind is in Soul's Individual stage only. Limited mind with its senses can not conceive how variagated and powerful are these attributes without which Soul would have remained a poor thing indeed. Soul's almightiness in this small visible universe gives no idea of Its attributes which appear skylike limitless in extent power knowledge bliss etc. For Soul's other two stages see paras 20 and 36. In man Soul is the father and mover of everything including his mind (15/15). Men are mentally different but not in Soul, Four hundred crore people of the world have got 400 crore minds over one and the same universal Soul.

In the Gita the Human Soul has been said to be eternal (17/2) and somewhere Jivatma or Individual Soul has been held to be Paramatma or Supreme Soul (22/2, 20/10) with the possibility of Jivatma being visible to the Yogis (11/15). This one-Soul theory contradicts the three-God theory of the Gita mentioned in para 12. God and Soul being actually the same thing, how can they thus differ in number ?

Then about the functions of the Soul. There a sitll more damaging confusion has been made. Not in different stages of the Soul as shown above, but in the same Human Stage somewhere the Soul has been said to be active and somewhere passive. It has been avowed that the Soul lies bound down with the Three Qualities in the body (5/14) and also that the Soul lies ever free and passive in the body (31/13). But repudiating that it has also been said that lying in the human heart God dances people like marionettes (61/18). If He is the mover (5/9) how can He be passive ? The passive unattributed Void stage of the Soul has been confused with Its active attributed Individual stage. God is not active and passive simultaneously in the same man. While in body the Soul is active and not passive. But simultaneously Brahman can have active and passive stages in respect of several men as shown in para 38, for while one Yogi may be in human stage just then another Yogi may be in nonmanifest stage.

Then about the joys and sorrows (6/17) of the Soul. Couplet 21/13 of the Gita says that He is attributeless but still suffers and enjoys because of His company with Prakriti. Against this Sloka 23/13 again says that the Soul is a passive witness in the body though He is the sustainer and rearer thereof. But how a passive unattributed entity like Soul can be affected by an attributed entity like Prakriti ? The bondage and suffering is really of the projected sensible mind and not of the almighty Soul. See para 19.

17. The philosophical implication of the above anomaly is that the Gita shifts ground between Monism, Qualified Monism and Dualism. But while Shankara speaks of Param Nirgunam Brahman (Brahman is not Kant's Noumenon) becoming Sagunam Brahman through Maya, he really does not discard Monism though because of this Maya the hypothesis of attributelessness is affected. The case is however otherwise with Ramanuja who holds that individual Souls have sprung from Brahman and will ever remain separate. Consequently Shankar's way of liberation is Jnana, while that of Ramanuja is Bhakti like that of others who hold that man is a created subordinate creature.

3RD CHAPTER

COSMOGONY OR CREATION

18. Indian philosophy in general holds that the root cause of this world tree is up in the Nonmanifest. But in details of world expansion there is difference of opinion. The general Upanishadic trend (say of Brihadaranyak, Mundaka, Aitarya, Tithiriya, Sandogya etc.) is that God created this material world of things and beings at His sweet will. But it is against the ultra-vedantic theory that God is unattributed and passive and this world is not created at all and hence it is all Maya or illusion (like the blue of the sky ?). In the other Vedantic way if the world be held as a dream of Brahman, it becomes half Maya, for thereby it begets a dream status at least. Against this Sankhya admits creation in a qualified way. It holds that the imbalanced state of the qualities of Satwa, Raja and Tama of independent Prakriti (mind) produces the sense of the world and the balanced state of these qualities causes the sense of dissolution thereof and thus this world is a mental feeling only, matter being an emanation from the mind. Yoga supports Sankhya's theory of world expansion from mind but holds that mind or Prakriti is not independent but is a projected power of the attibuted Indi-

vidual Soul. (Sensible mind creating nonsensible matter is like fingers growing insensible nails ?) In keeping with this the Gita affirms the projection of this world by God through His own power of Prakriti (mind.). See paras 40 and 36 about world expansion, mind and matter both.

Gita's theory is commendable. But it is not pursued systematically. In actual field the Gita presents a zigsaw puzzle. It is due to adopting two anomalous theories of creation—the Bhakti theory of an outside attributed God creating things and beings and the Sankhya theory of separate Prakriti creating the world with Purusha or Soul lying passive. Under these two clashing theories there are subordinate clashes again. Under the Bhakti theory Brahma, Rishis etc. have been introduced as creators ; under the Sankhya theory the creating Prakriti somewhere remains as the independent Prakriti of Sankhya and somewhere becomes the dependent Prakriti of Krishna. But Sankhya ill goes with Bhakti, for it cripples the active God of Bhakti.

After hypostatizing that God par excellence is the creator and destroyer (20/10) it has been upheld that Rishis created creatures and these Rishis were mentally created by God (6/10). Again in the Sankhya way God has been said to be creating through another agency, namely Prakirti (4, 5/7). This Prakriti is said to be inexorably guiding all beings (27-33/3, 59/18). Purusha (Soul or Brahman) is somewhere Himself attracting Prakriti (7/15, 22/13) somewhere is bound down by Prakriti (5/14) and somewhwere is held to be eternally separable (20/13) and ever detached (9/9, 29/13). Prakriti somewhere is shown to be producing the world because of the will and force of God (6/4, 5/7, 10/9, 4/14) and somewhere said to be independently evolving and devolving the world (14/5), all human deeds being the work of Prakriti and not of the Soul (29/13, 27/3). Simultaneously it has also been held that things sprout from and dissolve into the Nonmanifest Prakriti. (18/8) Besides this Nonmanifest Prakriti there is a Nonmanifest God also (20/8). In Mahabharata also (the whole Mahabharata is replete with Sankhya ideas, particularly its Book 12) Prakriti and Purusha emerge from and recede into the Nonmanifest.

19. Gita's Prakriti is somewnere Kapila's independent Prakriti (14/5, 20-21/13, 51/4) but elsewhere It is God's power (4-6/7). Again to cap the chaos in Vedantic way Prakriti has been called an illusion also. In general Gita's Prakriti may be

held to be God's power making the whole thing virtually monistic though in repeated assertions that Prakriti does the work but man (man's Soul) falsely thinks himself to be the agent (27/3) the Gita does not seem to be dispossessed of the ghost of Sankhya's independent Prakriti.

Shakti of Tantra has often been confused with Prakriti. But Shakti (Kali, Durga) is neither separate from Siva nor nondivine and insensible. Sankhya's Prakriti is separate from Purusha and insensible and Gita's Prakirti (with mental ego and matter) is at least partially insensible and nondivine. Tantra's Shakti is like the creating and rearing Individual Soul and Siva there is the same force at rest like Nonmanifest Soul. Similarly the Prakriti of Krishna is said to have turned into Radha in Brahmavaivarta Puran, like Gita the earlier Mahabharata and Vishnu Puran, Harivansa and Bhagavat not knowing any Radha. [Radha this way becomes divine, but Radha is also known as a separate human devotee (mental I) of Krishna].

Any how in constitution Gita's God-projected Prakriti is more powerful than Sankhya's separate independent nonsentient Prakriti. Gita's Prakriti (4-5/7) is exclusively divided into two parts, the sentient and the nonsentient. The first consists of a sensible force and the second of eight factors of mind, intellect, ego and the five elements though in 5-6/13 Khetra has been said to be much wider. As God's power Gita's Prakriti is also permanent at the root though functioning intermittently.

Sankhya's Prakriti is 24 limbed successively consisting of nonmanifest Prakriti, intellect, ego, virtues of five senses, the eleven sense and action organs, including mind and the five gross elements. (The finer chemical elements are involved in these five gross elements.) Here the microcosm of one expands into the macrocosm of 24 (see para 38). This is said to be Parinam or becoming of Prakiriti (as gas becomes water) against Aparinam or nonbecoming and nonchange of Purusha or Soul. It is not merely fine Prakriti or mental faculties knowing the five gross elements but Prakriti becoming those elements. (Mark that the mind of western conception with ego sense is wider and more sensible than the technical mind of Sankhya or of Gita without ego sense—4/7. The western division of mind into knowing, feeling and willing is of kind of quality and hence horizontal, but the Indian division of mind into Satwa, Raja and Tama is of degree of quality and hence vertical. A combination of these two gives a fuller idea of mind).

Of the above 24, Prakriti itself is immortal but insensible (it gets sense from Purusha) attributed and variable, while the 23 offshoots growing from Prakriti are insensible variable and mortal. What about life sense ? By aphorism 113/5 of Sankhya life breath is born of the senses. But full life sense (15/13) with mind (even bone and hair have life though not feeling which has made life happy and unhappy both) according to Sankhya and Parasar seems to grow out of the association of Purusha and Prakriti (one influencing the other), but according to the Gita life sense seems to lie in the first mentioned Para Prakriti (5/7, 22/10). (Protoplasm, sparmatosa, gene etc are only the finer mechanism of life).

But what about the sufferings of life and release therefrom ? There in Sankhya way the Gita says that in life Purusha or Soul is passive spectator only (23, 31/13) but Purusha suffers there due to inflictions of Prakriti on Purusha (20-21/13, 5/14). This is only repeating the Sankhya stand, which is against Gita's own Bhakti stand. If Soul or God is so helpless Himself how can He save His devotees ?

The Gita again says that the Soul enjoys through the mind and the senses (9/15). But Yogic light shows that the pleasures and pains of individuality are really of the playing semi-autonomous mind which is sensible unlike Sankhya's Prakriti and not of the accompanying Soul which is ever above these lower pains and pleasures. (just as the pleasures and pains of getting and losing the baloon is of the child and not of the accompanying father). But like the father the soul is not absolutely disinterested in the impunged play which is really caused by It. But this happy or unhappy result of the work of Prakiriti or mind is not absolutely immutable. Individual pleasures and pains go as the Soul at Its intended time submerges the mind, just as the troubles of our cricketing go when we give up the play. If the mind is permanently submerged or effaced it means happy dissolution of individuality or Mukti. The inner Soul-mind combination of man is like his outer head-hair combination. As the head grows changing hair to form the new pattern of hairy head so the Soul grows changing mind to form the new pattern of minded Soul called man. Man is a two tuned orchestra—the jarring mind tune and the fine Soul tune. In ordinary lives there is an overtone of mind, in saintly lives there is an overtone of Soul. If the sovereign Soul stops Its projected mind tune, one gets full Soul tune only. That is Mukti. The whole play looks like one of contraction and expansion of the Soul which appears like Its bondage and freedom.

4TH CHAPTER

MUKTI OR SALVATION

20. Now let us see what the Gita says about the most important question of Mukti or salvation. But what is salvation in itself ? It is liberation or rather wilful dissociation of the Individual Soul from its so-called knot with mind and body which are its own projections. In fact the so-called Individual Soul withdraws the mind to dissolution of individuality and remains alone freed from Its human play. Thus liberation is blissful dissolution of individuality through peaceful Samadhi. What is man's gain here ? It frees man from the troubles and limitations of individuality—death, disease, defeat etc. that are of the mind and body. (This will show how the ordinary man helplessly identifies himself with his impermanent mental personality only).

We have depicted individuality as a knot of body, mind and Soul because human play is not possible without the Soul. But the Soul is not helplessly bound in the Knot. Some have held that the Soul lies chained in the five Koshas or sheaths of individuality, namely body, breath, mind, world sense and individual joys. This is underestimating Soul's omnipotence. The Soul inducts and accompanies these sheaths no doubt. But It does that freely and It is free to detach Itself from these sheaths also. So called Individual Soul of course is the player in this human play and not the socalled Universal Soul or the Nonmanifest Soul. See para 16.

But is emancipation possible in this very life without giving up body and mind ? Here there is a western theory of man some day bing able to live as the immortal All-Powerful. In India also many of the Bhaktas (mind their theory of Nritya-Vrindavan) and some individuality-minded Yogis want to ever live as wider individuals but not as the freest Full (Bhuma). But rippling psycho-physical individuality is created for temporary play. Its permanence is neither possible not desirable. For the sake of fuller freedom not only Individuality but even the Universal stage of the Soul becomes difficult to be retained.

The Gita postulates that Brahmananda is enjoyable in this life (27-28/5). But Gita's attributeless individuality of 25/14, 54/18 seems to be a hyperbole. Individuality is created by attributes and as soon as one is fully devoid of attributes he becomes passive and ceases to be an individual (20/14). This individuality of the Gita seems to be a freer individuality still within the bounds of mind or Guna (Prakiriti). It is not liquidating Prakiriti in full when any individual functioning (even in astral body) is impossible. But again in its usual vein of contradiction in 5, 16/15 the Gita speaks of absolutisation being possible beyond individuality only. Only in Samadhi Brahmahood is attained but at that stage functioning as an individual becomes impossible. From there one may or may not come back to life. Really from inside the box of the mind the individual can not touch, know or be God. He can be God, the impersonal Universal, only after estinguishing the mind.

The Gita asserts that Yogis see the Soul in the body (20/6, II/15). Here the seeing is of the attributed mind associated creating Jiva Soul and the seer is the mind (higher mind) which though projected by the Soul functions as a separate limited personality. The so-called Individual Soul has two stages, mind-linked and mind-free, both of which appear limited. What the purged mind of the Yogi can thus dualistically sense is the Soul in Its mind-linked sphere in the body (not Its mind-free form) which is comparable with twisted thread. And psychophysical is such dualistic sensing. The inner eye perceives the Soul as mild limited glabeela glow and the mind perceives It as a talking personality, the mind then having dialogue with It. But the limited mind can never know the Soul as It really is. This mental sensing, which is blindness still, does not enable the Yogi to fully fathom the power and bliss of the Soul, nor to conquer death and all woes of individuality. Peace and immortality is had only when bereft of the mind and its gloom the Yogi in Samadhi becomes identical with the attributed Individual Soul, which though nonscattering, really is not so limited in power and bliss, Soul's attributes being unlike and so wider than mind's attributes. (This is more difficult of course). There is a world of difference between mentally seeing Jiva Brahman and actually being Jiva Brahman. Attainment of the state of mind-free Individual Soul is sufficient for immortality. The first real Soul realisation of all Yogis is of this mind-free nonscattering Individual Soul. The higher Universal and Void stages of the

Soul are realised later, but all Yogis can not reach those more blissful stages. The returning Yogis are returners from their respective summits. (See paras 16 & 36). Man can not at once go to the most blissful Nonmanifest without passing through the two lower attributed stages of the Soul. Mind this against 5/12.

21. But who is to win emancipation, the Soul or the mind ? There the Gita gives no clear answer and further makes a confusion between Soul self and mental self. But really the Soul is the actual redeemer. Human play is a joint play of Soul, mind and body no doubt. But in this play the mind and body only dance to the high or low tune of the Soul who is the real dancer. In the play the Soul remains unperceived and the mind is mistaken as a fully free agent.

In the Gita somewhere it is said that God is nonmanifest and nonactive (24/7) and that Purusha is attainable by Purusha only (15/10). But elsewhere going aslant it has been held that Karmi (38/4) and Bhakta (56/18) can attain even the unattributed self of God. Then somewhere it is said that the undeluded and the self-controlled only attain Absolutisation (5/15) and that liberation is attainable by rising above the Three Qualities (20/14). but it has been held that Bhakti enables to conquer the Three Qualities (26/14). Again after asserting that immoral people can not get God (14/47) it has been obliquely held that Bhakta (31/9) and Jnani (36/4) can get God despite immorality. Conceding further the Gita allows sensual activity and with a hedonistic air even denounces self-control as mortification of the Soul (33/3, 6, 19/17) which elsewhere has been said to be sensation-free and indestructible (15-25/2). Even failure to fully do Nishkam Karma has been declared to be not a sin (40/2).

Couplet 5/6 says that man is to rescue the Soul through self-control. But who is this Man, mental I or Soul I ? Slokas 41/3, 22/16 say that man's lust is eradicable by man (by 43/3, 35/6 intellect is to conquer the mind and by 7/3, 24/6 mind is to conquer the senses) but 33/3 says that even intellectuals being driven by Prakriti, bid for control of sensuality is in vain. Couplet 14/7 says that Maya is difficult to get over.

22. For redemption the suggested paths are of Yoga, Jnana, Bhakti and Karma which lie separated by different theories of God and modes of salvation. Here the riddle is that not different men but the same Arjun is asked in 66/18 to submit to God with Bhakti (where also he is to distinguish between

the assumed self and the real self of God-55/18) but in 53/18 to be Brahman himself and in 15, 20/6 to be a Yogic Absolute. Again 27/3 and 14/18 ask him to be reasoning that Prakriti and fate are producing Karma and that can not bind him. But the knot of individuality is formed by the Soul and the mind or Prakriti being linked together. So there can be no redemption without effacing the mind first. The factors of effort and intensity play their part in liberation. In some cases there is more practice less intensity, but in others less practice more intensity. The Soul is of course behind all this. In fact Jnana and Bhakti are only conational and volitional activities of the mind. But the Soul or God being extramental, these mental activities by themselves can not win Soul or God. Jnana and Bhakti only weaken the mind and the ego for easier expression of Soul or God.

The Gita seems to be stressing too much on mental reasoning and mental light. But Sankhya itself says by 29/3 that Thought Samadhi is not salvation. In the Gita in 58, 68/2, and 14/7 there are no doubt hints of the need of extramental realisation. But Katha Upanishad boldly asserts that one who is not calm and peaceful and free from wickedness wlil never win Self by merely reasoning. And Munda Upanishad says that the Spirit can not be gained by intellect and learning. He is realisable only by him whom the Spirit chooses ; his body the Spirit elects as his own. (Reasoning really is a virtue of the blind mind, omniscient God has no reasoning).

5TH CHAPTER

SIDE ISSUES

23. Now to turn to some side issues of the Gita. Like all Hindu Shastras the Gita presupposes rebirth and ascend and descend in different births till salvation is attained (43/6). (Some indeed retain the memory of their previous births). Things are said to come from and go to the Nonmanifest Prakriti (so this is like expansion and contraction of Prakriti) during the night and day of Brahma (18/8). (Now according to Manu a day or night of Brahma is equal to 43,20,00,000 years only while science holds that this world evolved out of the Sun about 10,000 million years back, animal life here being only

about 2,000 million years old. But unlike other planets how Earth got gas and water for animal life ? Water grew out of heat ? Now also there are hydrogen and oxygen here. Why do they not mix at the ratio of H^2O to form fresh water?) At the end of the Aeon things dissolve into the qualitative Prakriti of God who creates them again at the start of a new Aeon (7/9). The point is not wearing out but withdrawal of the world. This dissolution theory however is evidently dualistic against the monistic theory espoused by the Gita elsewhere.

24. There is a thesis about the course of life in the meantime also. Like Chhandagya Upanishad it is held that one's form in the next life is determined by his last thought at the time of his death (6/8) and the rise of the particular Guna or attribute at that hour (14-18/14). Creatures take the senses of previous birth to the next birth (8-10/15), the new body being like the new garment (like new snake slough) of the birthless and deathless Soul (22/2). (So this troublesome birth and death is really of the body only and not even of the mind which continues till redemption. The transmigration is really of the changing mind and not of the unchanging Soul.) One dying during his Satwa or Raja or Tama Guna is reborn as demi-god, or man or beast respectively (14-15/14). But the Yogi who leaves his body with his mind withdrawn gets absolutisation beyond rebirth (9-10/8), the hour of the day, the new moon and the summar being propitious hour of such death (24/8). People fallen from Yoga are reborn in the houses of the Yogis or the rich (41/6). Desire-ridden people beget bad, mixed and good results in the next life (12/18). But birth is had (25/8) in the Moon (which the Apollos do not support) and in Heaven (21/9) where atrributed gods (40/18) are said to be living. Demonic people are cast by God in demonic womb (19/16) and demonic virtue causes destruction (9/16). But this heaven life may be mental habitation or notion only without any corporal existence, dissipating with the dissipation of the mind. In this connection Yogavashistha says that Earth, Heaven and Hell are only mental phantasies and disappear with the disappearance of the mind. (The phenomena of the growth and decay of life are also understood by the actual phenomenon of Samadhi ? See para 36).

25. There is a cheap panacia against this punishment also. The Gita says that the spirits of the dead are delivered through offerings of Pinda or food (42/1). Then believe it or not, po-

pular belief not only in Brahma but many other demigods like Yama, Agni, Aswinikumar, Siddhas, Solistice Gods etc. has also been upheld (22, 39/11). The Moon being the biggest star and the Sumaru being the best hill are ignorable inaccuracies. There is also the commercialism of creator Brahma having asked creatures to propitiate Gods with Yajna or sacrifice for good from them in return (11/3). Curiously enough Soma drink also is said to be purging sins (30/9). Is all this mere unenlightened mentality or interpolation ?

26. On many other ancillary issues also there is no decisive opinion, say on violence and non-violence. The Gita inculcates both fighting and nonviolence. Somewhere nonviolence has been commended (5/10, 2/16, 14/17) and even worklessness (16/12) and renunciation of society (11/13) has been justified, but again Arjuna has been urged to the fratricidal fight for Heaven or Earth (37/2, 33/11) while vindicating dispassionate disinterested work elsewhere (48/2, 8/3).

The Gita does not believe in winning violence with nonviolence and love like Buddha or Christ, but supports violence against violence. Any way like acid and alkali war and Bhakti go ill together. For a nonviolent Vaishnava like Chaitanya following the fighting urge of fighter Krishna is rather difficult. Killing is philosophically justified. There the Gita says that one who knows that the Soul neither kills nor is killed can be construed to be not killing anybody (19-21/2, 17/18). But for such a self-realised man is there any activity ? For him to fight is to fight against himself. Mundaka Upanishad truly says that "On realising Him the knots of one's heart are pierced and all doubts are dispelled and all his acts come to an end." And like couplets 19, 33/4, 3/6 of the Gita the Mahanirvantantra also holds that "On the rise of Brahma Jnana all duty and nonduty ceases." Yogis know that if the mind and Kundalini rise very high the mind becomes nonviolent. Then striking others becomes impossible and others also (even tigers and snakes) can not strike him.

The Gita gives no practical idea of Yoga or of Soul and Samadi. Blindly hitting it says in 14/6 that Yogis must do devotional mentalisation while in 25/6 it says that Yogis must do no mentalisation. The latter is only correct. Again 29/6 says that Yogis see God in all things and beings. But in Samadi the Yogis become mind-free Soul and see no other things and beings. This God vision in all objects is only an inference of the mental plane. See para 46.

Again blowing hot and cold in 61/18 the Gita says that the Soul lies active in the body while in 31/13 it says that Soul lies passive in the body. But Samadhi experience says that Soul is passive in its Normanifest state only but is active in Its Individual stage in the body. The Soul is attributed and creating in Its Individual stage, attributed and noncreating inIts Universal stage and unattributed and noncreating in Its Nonmanifest stage.

The home truths of higher and lower planes have been confused elsewhere as well. If man be viewed as a Soul personality, then only man has no work. But in a lower way if you hold man to be a free limited individual (mental I) and want him to do any work, you must follow the appropriate moral responsibility of the individual. God himself acts differently in mental and extramental planes. Gita's plea is like trying to pass through an ice block on the ground that water is gaseous. In the worldly plane can a murderer offer the plea or alibi that he murdered nobody because the Soul is unmurderable ?

27. Some logical inferences of the Gita are equally curious, for example, that one's suffering is due to the contact of the senses with objects. That is transitory and hence he should bear it (14/2). But is not the conquest of individual suffering the quest of all spirituality? Unless the mind is dispassionate and ripe, can I get salvation if I merely keep myself confined within my house to avoid contact with outer objects ? Another syllogism of the Gita is that creatures are produced by crops, crops by rain, rain by Yajna. (oblation), Yajna by Karma, Karma by Veda and Veda by Brahman ; hence Brahman is always in Yajna (14-15/3). Equally naive and fanciful is the relevation series that God first revealed Yajna to the Sun, the Sun revealed it to Manu (the Indian Adam) and Manu revealed it to Ikshaku (1/4). It becomes guillible only if the Sun be construed as a man.

28. The tangled maze noticable in the Gita is not a little due to the theory of *incarnation* or corporality of God (8/4). It has a mythological tinge. In the Mahabharata Krishna is said to be a worshipper of Siva and he asks Arjuna before the Kuruksetra fight to pray to Durga. In the original Mahabharata (of 24 thousand slokas) Kishna appears as an efficient politician

and not as an Avatar or Man-God. In the Udyoga Parva there Krishna himself says that he can make efforts, but he can not undo destiny.

But in the Gita Krishna has been deified (8/4, 11/9) into immortal God (with four arms—46/11) and clothed as the unborn Absolute of Sankhya (15/6, 12-21/8, 8/9, 37/11, 13/13, 55/18) which has no work (22/3, 24/7) though again in 12/2 and 5/4 Krishna is said to be subject to repeated births and deaths like other mortals. In Bhagavat also Krishna is worshipped by Brahma as nondual, attributeless and immotal. Like the Gita (8/4) the Bhagavat also vouches for innumerable Avatars of God (here remember the traditional animal Avatars also) which steals its magalomania. But couplet 24/7 of the Gita also says that only fools consider the nonmanifest God to be personified.

This Avatarvad is like hero worship. It is a creation of the Bhakti school of the Puranic age, Veda, Upanishada, Vedanta, Jainism, Buddhism etc. not knowing it. Avatar is not God's son or prophet but God himself and the adverse points there are the unconcealable human faults and limitations (the extreme faith-insulated few only can remain unaffected by it). In the Gita Krishna has become the four-armed Vishnu (49-50/11) and the ensuing Puranic age started Krishna worship which is not yet outdated like the worship of older Gods like Indra, Brahma etc. (This way Homer also created several Greek Gods before the assertion of Christianity that there is no redemption except through Christ.) The Chaturvuha idea (of Balaram, Krishna, Krishna's son Pradumna by one of his ten wives, Pradumnas son Anirudha) makes Godship a family monopoly.

In the theory of man-God there is a philosophical difficulty of course. Gita's theory that Divinity is really universal and impersonal and that It is in everything (not particularly in Krishna) axes the foundation of Avatarism of the Gita. The Gita has made the nonmanifest Noumenon to be personal and manifest (24/7, 4/9, 55/18) in Krishna only. Couplet 20/2 says that Soul or God has no birth or death. Does it not make Krishna's Godhood rather untenable since he had both birth and death ? All human beings however big are only born limited mind-bound mortals and not unlimited mindfree God. They can at best be "Sohams" who attain universality after crossing the Ajnya Chakra but again descend down to limited manhood but retain the memory of their universality even when circumscribed by human limitations.

In real monism there is only God and no Non-God worthy of being saved. The Gita does not know that by saying "I am God, you worship me" Krishna assumes other Non-Gods to be existent and thus blows off such monistic absolutism in favour of dualism. The purpose of a God of the Bhakti path and the unattributed Absolute of the Jnana path have been sought to be saved thereby though the characteristic repudiation is also there that Krishna is not the unattributed Absolute (1-5/12). Any way after the death of the Avatar the advantage of worshipping a direct personal God also ceases. Then it becomes as difficult as the worship of the Nonmanifest (5/12).

In the Gita Krishna however does not win the Kuruksetra fight through any supernatural miracle, nor does he reveal any new truth. Krishna fails to give any description of Sagun Brahmahood even (which the Yogis remember and describe) though calling himself God. And like Vyas or Valmiki or any other Yogi, Krishna of course also fails to fathom the mystery of the Nonmanifest (28/2, 21/8). He also fails to avoid death (arrow-wounded) of ordinary mortals. (And despite being the greatest Brahma Jnani (47/11) Arjun dies of snow-bite and not by Samadhi). But in exhibition of Biswarup or cosmic vision (which was not visible to others) enough supernaturalism has been conjured up (see para 46).

6TH CHAPTER

OMISSIONS AND COMMISSIONS

29. The thesis that we have projected in this booklet is that God or Soul creates or rather expands this world of things and beings through His own power of mind, but God has a higher noncreating stage as well and as mind-bound creatures Bhaktas and Jnanis should concern themselves with and seek to attain the above creating stage of God leaving His passive noncreating stage to be attained later.

In its synthesis the Gita failed to reach any such all comprehensive practical solution though its random shots covered some of our points. The central confusion of the Gita is for failing in the practical field to distinguish between creating and noncreating roles of God and secondly for missing the fact that two personalities work in man, the Soul personality and the mental personality whose purging and effacement is the sole necessity in salvation.

The Gita has even given a mislead against salvation by holding out the Sankhya excuse (27, 33/3, 14/5) that Prakriti is not controlable by man. But this (Prakriti-thusti) is self-contradictory and an abettor of anti-Mukti Egoism also. Prakriti is nothing but your tangible mind. The mind certainly can control itself if it is thus held to be free. Prakriti or mind becomes uncontrolable if in the Yogic way it is held to be induced by Soul or God. But then the anti-salvation harm of Egoism can not thrive.

30. The Gita is sought to be palmed off by the threat of damnation against its enlightened scrutiny (32/3). But despite this rationality will ask why every Yes of the Gita is followed by a full No or half No. How Nishkam Karma could be held both capable and incapable of giving salvation ? Accepting man as God how could it accept both creation (by Prakriti) of Sankhya and non-creation (Maya) of Vedanta ? Affirming Arjun as immortal Soul how could it again ask him to worship Krishna for his immortality ? Avowing that God has become man (17/2, 7/15) how could it ask man to worship God (34/9) ? And holding that God is not in man (5/9) how could it hold that God suffers by being entangled with Prakriti in man (20/13, 5/14) and again that God is passive and non-suffering in man (32/13, 16/18) ?

31. As a corollary of this on the vital point of man's free will also there has been a lot of bungling. While holding that man is not a free agent (because of Prakriti 33/3 or of Soul 61/18) Arjuna has been asked to freely do this or that. Again Arjuna has been held as workless Soul and been asked to work like ordinary man also. This is a confusion of two conceptions of man, man the unlimited (Shivoham) and man the limited (Jivoham). The mental self has a very limited autonomy indeed. The attachments and detachments of the senses (34/3) are not really by their authority i. e. Prakriti, but ultimately because of God's will. Gita's Prakriti being a power of God, it cannot be separately held responsible for sensuality (27/3). The Gita has no clear idea that man's Soul part is God, not his Prakriti (mind) part. Hence this confusion.

About this advice of duty also there is quite a paradox. If man is a created limited handicapped being, where is his free will and capacity to do the ideal ? He needs divine grace and help more than advice. Here remember the monkey system and the cat system of Bhakti, the latter stressing that (like deep water fish) man cannot rise up himself without divine help.

32. The attempt at offering a mixture of the four paths for the same spiritual patient (Arjuna) has made the whole thing very disconcerting and shaky. Their approaches are different. The appraoch of Yoga is through mind-mincing, while the aproaches of the rest are through the mind—in Jnana through the thinking, in Bhakti through the emotional side and in Karma through the volitional side of the mind (see para 22). (Each of these paths has a separate God theory, creation theory and salvation theory). Bhakti and Karma mix well as do Jnana and Yoga. But these two groups are allergic to each other. One cannot consider himself Brahman and again worship any outside God. This is clash of Jnana and Bhakti.

Bhakti and Yoga initially disagree. Bhakti wants to retain the mind in a sublimated form but Yoga wants to liquidate it in full. Bhakti says "Manmana Bhava" be Godminded, but Yoga says "Bimana Bhava" be mindless. This mindlessness of Yoga means worklessness as well. In fact prayer in the midst of Yoga is found to dim the brain halo (Atma Jyoti). By no hocus-pocus can these two be united.

The mixture of Jnana and Karma also has proved abortive. For Nishkam fight in Kuruksetra Arjuna has been asked first to have the Jnana realisation that the Soul is universal and immortal. But one who realises that the Soul is one and indivisible with whom and why is he to fight ? Even advanced people feel like Maitrayee—"What shall I do with that which will not make me immortal ?"

In the attempt at synthesis of Jnana and Bhakti a shocking discrepancy has been introduced in the Constitution theory and Relief theory. In the theory of world constitution most often the Godless Sankhya theory has been taken (though the taker (Krishna) claims himself to be God). But in the theory of man's salvation a benign God has been ushered in for worship. This has served to shake faith in the whole fabric.

The Jnana theory that God is unattributed and noncreating and the Bhakti theory that God is attributed and creating have been theorctically synthesised by the rounder view that God is both active and creating and passive and noncreating. But the chasm between their practice paths has remained unbridged and in fact Arjuna and others (68/18) have been asked to realise through Bhakti and Jnana that Krishna is both attributed and unattributed. But the Jnani there feels that he is noncreated (Maya-bound) God himself and he can not worship any other outside God, far less swallow Avatarism. (There are practical cases of Sohams refusing to worship any other outside God). There the Bhakta also feels that he is a created creature of benign God and he cannot worship the hobgoblin of unattributed noncreating God. In the last two thousand years this synthesis has not borne fruit because of the above practical difficulty of separate tendencies and stages of men, still the Bhaktas being warned not even to touch Jnana treatises. (see para 43). The light in this Age old gloom is that it is the attributed Individual Soul that (mentally) creates and not the passive Non-manifest. See synthesis in para 42.

One feels scandalised that instead of admitting these apostatic contradictions each Indian commentator of the Gita has sought to give a twisted interpretation to all the concepts according to his favourite path. Shankara has said that "the Gita teaches attainment of Moksha by means of firm foundation in knowledge preceded by renunciation of all action." Sridhar and Tilak have underlined Bhakti and Karma respectively as the cardinal principles of the Gita. Some yet have treated the Gita as a Yogic allegory. Quibbling in all these often is of the fantastic philistinian order.

33. Now about the merits of the Gita. As a humble seeker of truth we have given a criticism of the Gita in the light vouchafed to us. But let us also add here that the Gita cannot be dismisstd merely as a mythogical drama or war philosophy, nor as a gospel of the saviourism of four-armed Krishna. The story part in the Gita like the story part of Nachiketa in the Upanishad (which is for popular conviction) may not be all-appealing, but the sublime truths propounded in the both can not be ignored. It has only to be taken with a grain of salt.

True, the Gita is not fool-proof. But while many contradictions of the Gita are due to want of vigilance, its encyclopaedic quest also generated very many. The Gita would have been much free from contradiction if instead of trying futile synthesis of the four paths separate selfexclusive chapters were devoted to the paths with hint that the aspirant is free to adopt any of these. A stand on two boats is always risky. Poetic effusion merely can not cover inner incongruity or hollow quackism.

However in the synthesis work the Gita has scored at least one point. That is with regard to Bhakta's God and Sankhya's Prakriti. The Gita has synthesised these two by saying that God projects this world through His Gunas (sentient Prakriti). This is somewhat like the Yogic truth of Individual Soul projecting mind and matter

Whatever the historical context, in lucid jargon-free poetry and short compass the Gita gives an exposition of the philosophy of all the paths—though elementary is its treatment of the paths of Jnana and Yoga. Though the paths lie mixed up gogether and further vitiated by the synthesising attempt, the scantilating eye can discern the kernal of each Path therein. And moral discipline which is the common gateway to salvation of all has on the whole been well stressed in the Gita. For all this the Gita has an uncanny appeal to the worshippers of other Dieties and the followers of all the paths. In a general way in the ocean of Hindu treatises there is no other book as comprehensive as the Gita though the Gita has failed to give a concrete picture of the two most important points of spirituality, namely Soul and Samadhi (see paras 16 and 36).

The Gita has an overtone of Bhakti and Karma at the cost of Yoga and Jnana. Its Bhakti expostulations are an invaluable treasure for the ordinary man. If God worshippers through other names substitute their own Gods in place of Kirshna, their conscience becomes clear. Some of the choicest gems of the Gita are true for all, as for example, that liberation is attainable by rising above the Gunas and that God is the mover of all things and beings. There are many brilliant Slokas in the whole book and one of them is sufficient for the whole life of a devotee.

7TH CHAPTER

RAJA YOGA OR ABSOLUTISATION

34. Now let us have a particular glance at the four conventional paths of salvation envisaged by the Gita. Amongst them Raja Yoga tries mind-missing (25/6) from the start and does not proceed so much through the mind while other paths proceed through the mind medium. Raja Yoga (King of Yogas)

is difficult but in it attainment of immortality is a clearly detectable phenomenon. The later verse Upanishads better prized the direct testimony of Raja Yoga. Katha Upanishad has a description of progressive demindisation and Sankhya also advocates and cites Raja Yoga as authority. The Gita itself notices Raja Yoga (27-28/5, 28/6, 53/18) and prescribes a Yogic act as the last work of life (13/8) i.e. raising breath to the Glabeela (Ajnya Chakra) though it does not give any expert exposition of Yoga and Samadhi.

The theory of Yoga is based on practical experience of Soul, mind and body. According to Yogic realisation Soul or Brahman has three phases—'Sagun (creating) Jiva Brahman, Sagun Infinite Brahman and Nirgun Brahman. Descending as it were from Its freest and happiest state of the unattributed Nonmanifest which appears like a blissful void, the immortal Soul assumes attributes or senses of universality, immoratality, almightiness, blessedness etc. and becomes the attributed Universal (which is an abstract powerful super sense without the sense of mind or of time space body and matter) and secondly the mind-free or mind-associated Individual Soul by assuming notional cover after cover and again from manhood goes to the attributed Universal and then to the free bourn of the Nonmanifest Void sundering all these attributes and notional layers which It then deems to be undesirable. (This disavows another independent Prakriti as held by Sankhya and Patanjal but disowned by Vedanta). This mystery is beyond mind, beyond science. (See paras 16 & 20).

In the creating Individual stage the Soul which is the real man appears limited and remins concealed as it were behind the self-projected notion of the mind and the mental Ego (which is Its own Prakriti). Brahman or Soul is only an abstract blissful nonegoistic extramental super consciousness both in Yoga and Jnana. This brings out two important points that the real individual is not the mortal mind and body but the deathless Soul or Brahman and that Brahman is both Sagun and Nirgun or attributed and unattributed. Man is only three and half cubits in body, more in mind and still more in Soul. Yoga necessarily touches all these three.

35. Like Jnana and Bhakti paths Yoga also has a practice path. The theory behind its modus operandi is that Soul and mind (which is the projection of the Soul) together form the egoistic knot of individuality. Redemption is untying this

knot of personality and it is by elimination of the mind. Just as rice plus husk is the paddy and paddy minus husk is rice, so Soul plus mind is the limited man and man minus mind is the immortal Soul. So withdraw or cut out the wild mind that projects the woeful limitation of egoism and individuality. With full withdrawal of the mind the sense of egoistic personality and material world vanishes to emergence of a consciousness of free almighty immortality (Sagun Samadhi prior to Nirgun Samadhi), the Yogi then feeling that he alone ever exists as the incorporal blissful immortal "Absolute". Noncreating stages of attributed Universal and unattributed Void bloom later. The 3rd stages is of blissful nothingness.

Here comes the question of man's free will and morality both. The real withdrawer of the mind is of course the inlying Soul. But because of its false egoism the mind may think itself to be the author of it as in all other individual deeds. The Soul brings mental indifference gradually. For its required depersonalisation and demindisation the mental distractions which constitute the forte of the mind must first be done away with. Now lust, avarice, anger etc. are the greatest mental distractions whence they are called "Sin". Hence in natural maturation process these propensities get devitalised and attritioned step by step. In case after case in right time the almighty Soul asserts itself removing the cloud of the mind and its nations and thus goes the sense of egoistic personality with all its physical and mental ills.

After this mental aspect let us pay some heed to the physical aspect of Yoga also. Man is a combination of body, mind and Soul. The functions of the body (breath, sensation etc.) are determined by the qualities of the mind and the mind in its turn is regulated by the urges of the sovereign Soul. Through subtle nerves not known to the nervous system of doctors the incentives of the mind are gradually concretised in the body and the gross functions of the body are again abstracted (as through Hata Yoga) into the mind. The mind finally loses itself in the Soul. Spiritual elevation of the mind is found to create a brain glow which then goes up from below. But in spiritual degradation through lust, anger etc. the brain glow seems to be shooting down from upper brain as if your spiritual stock then comes down to save you.

To be more concrete, the superforce called Kundalini (which as the Shakti or active force of the Soul is in everyone and is the field worker in his individuality) in course of Its play changes position and quality in different men at different times according to the need of Its play. In ordinary man Kundalini lies at the lowest end of the backbone and therefrom It rises to the brain centre. This high or low position of Kundalini is responsible for higher or lower propensities of man and that way for his bondage in individuality or liberation therefrom. At Its stage between the neck and the eyebrow Kundalini much deadens the mind and its indulgences and makes the body effulgent and light enabling the subject to soar up and when It reaches the brain It dissipates into the Soul and the man attains Soul's blissful universality losing his individuality. Along with this rise of Kundalini a mild enthusing heatless glow is perceived under the glabeela and a sweet nonfrictional sound is heard through the right ear. The above glow is at first like Nebula but with more calming of the mind brightens into something like the Full Moon. At this Moon stage egoistic consciousness is lost. The Moon glow bursts into sparks and is estinguished just before the Soul sheds even (in the third stage) the last entaglement of bliss and becomes the freest void, the ultimate Reality beyond the bondage of existence even.

36. The initial process of Yoga is in calming the mind (but see that the mind does not fall asleep) and trying to see and hear the above glow and sound to stoppage of all breathing and mentalisation and eventual upsurge of the Soul. Decimation of the mind is the aim of Yoga. And this decimation is achieved through the process of withdrawing the mind from outer objects and sensations and passively concentrating it in one point. (Thus Yogic concentration is not like intellectual concentration which is more activisation of the mind in one point, but depriving the mind of all its thinking, feeling and willing wherein lies the real existence of the mind). This concentration and breath control help in non-activising and deadening the mind. This lightens the body also (then the brain however feels heavier) ultimately enabling it to soar in the sky while lending the mind with the power of clairvoyance (Rhetambhara Prajna) about physical things and events beyond the ken of ordinary men, but it gives no experience of the extramental plane of the Soul. The above physical practices come under what is known as Hata Yoga whose approach is through the body to the mind against direct deminidisation (without any prayer) of Raja Yoga. Hybernation is a Natural Hata Yoga.

Mind and physical function are closely connected. So change in one influences the other. There are different experiences on the mind being placed on different parts of the body. If the mind is up disease is not felt. Though still in mental and material plane, some Yogis can do without air, food and sleep. And some become permanently disembodied but not necessarily deminded and deindividualised. Though they can thus escape the pangs of further births and deaths, still they retain an abstract individuality and have yet to attain mind-free universality and real immortality. The lower disembodied minds known as ghosts are bound for rebirth.

Samadhi which is dissociation of Soul from mind and body is the pivotal point in Yoga. It is not mere negation or anaesthetic stilthiness where also there is similar loss of consciousness of sight, sound and sensation. It must give a positive Soul sense of (depersonalised and mind-free) full freedom, bliss, power, infinity and immortality. That way the Kumbhak (breath suspension) of Hata Yoga does not necessarily give Samadhi. Samadhi is had by Bhaktas also and it can happen only when the Kundalini crosses the demarcation line between individuality and non-individuality at the glabeela point (Ajnya Chakra). But it is not in mind's control. Samadhi is not obtainable merely by mind suspension (as in sleep) with all its thinking feeling and willing lying in dormant stage, but by total obliteration of the mind to loss of personality, the body then lying corpse like to which the Soul may or may not return.

Samadhi happens through the mechanism of the body of course. Together with corresponding demindisation first there is a happy all changing whirlwind of light in the brain. Through this convulsion (which is the practical mind husking process) there is gradual loss of mental consciousness (in Samadhi there is stilthiness of body and mind but greater Soul consciousness) of all objcts and sensations. First goes the sense of differentiation of objects and then the sense of whole objectivity. Finally disappears individuality with its senses of body, breath, mind and ego respectively. In place of woeful, individuality thereafter emerges a blissful Infinity. It is the dawning of super light. Samadhi may be for good or temporary with ascend and descend. As in the ascending stage of Samadhi first goes the breath and the mind and then the ego sense, so in descending stage from the sense of Infinity first rises the sense of Ego (Ahang) and then of mind, breath and sense of perception and this perceptual world (Idam). Thus Samadhi enables one to conquer death peacefully without breath trouble. The returning Yogi retains a pure consciousness (Suddha Chaitanya) up to the Sagun Brahaman stage but not up to the Nirgun Brahman or unattributed Void and so he can remember the two Sagun Brahmanhoods, Individual and Universal but not the Nirgun Brahmaood. (In some cases one is also unconsciously lifted to and brought down from the Soul stage.)

How and why is this Nirguna Brahmahood attained ? Like a blooming flower the so called Individual Soul first goes on expanding or unfolding Its Gunas of power, bliss etc. (Soul's Gunas are wider and more variagated than our known mental Gunas or attributes). Finally Ananda or bliss becomes Its dominent attribute. But thereafter It deems this Ananda also as a handicap to Its fullest freedom which is valued higher. So shedding this lingering Guna of Ananda the Soul ultimately turns into free attributeless (Nirgun) Void which appears like nonexistentiality (Asat Mahasunyam). Full freedom is beyond attribute and existence. This will show why Brahman or Soul is called both Sagun and Nirgun and both Sat and Asat or existing and nonexisting. Existence is also an attribute. So no existing sense can know this unattributed nonexistent Void Reality. For Samadhi full mind withdrawal from Idam and Ahang both is necessary. Often there is partial withdrawal of Idam or objective sensation only. That can not give real Samadhi of Soul sense. At a high state of ascend even when there is some sense of individuality the mind loses its powers of reasoning, willing etc. There is a kind of thought-absorbed Samadhi also, but such absorbtion according to Sankhya can not give liberation (see para 46). There is another variety also. After Brahma Jyoti and demindisation there is unconsciousness and the mind wakes therefrom with a sense of bliss. But what caused that bliss the mind does not recollect. Breath then goes to the glabeela.

Yoga is said to be pre-Aryan in India. But there is a variety in Yoga. Demindisation is the common ground in all Yogic systems (25/6). Tantra (Non-Vedic) with its stress on Kundalini and the opening of certain psycho-physical knots and its stages of Pashwachar, Virachar and Divyachar is also a Yogic practice, these graduated processes leading to their breathless and mindless trance. Jainism and Buddhism are not properly based on Yoga. Mahavir's Nirvana does not speak of demindisation. It is through proper faith, sense and conduct. Buddhist Samadhi is through mental contemplation on body, sensation, mind and phenomenon. It of course envisages extinction of all desires. In Aryan age Hiranyagarva is said to be the first propounder of Yoga. Patanjali's proposition is a later development from Sankhya.

8TH CHAPTER

THE PATH OF JNANA OR REASONING

37. The path of Jnana is one of mental contemplation and not of direct demindisation as in Raja Yoga. The path stresses that one can overcome his personal woes of limitation, death, decay etc. by mentally judging who he really is and wherefrom come these woes. The path has two channels, the Buddhist channel and the orthodox Hindu channel. The Buddhist channel stops at merely analysing the outer man which according to it is constituted by five Skshandas or sheaths of form, sensation etc. It says that the knowledge of his five sheaths frees man from the mistaken notion of personality and its woes. Buddha's final Nirvan of course is through decimation of desires. But the orthodox Hindu analysis dives deeper and finds a Soul or Reality behind the body and mind. It says that personal woes are not removable without self-identification with the Soul which is blissful immortal Brahman. The Soul is known as Brahman in Vedanta which is different from Suddha Vijnana (pure consciousness) of Vijnanavad of Buddhism.

Here we will deal with the orthodox Hindu system only. It assumes that the Soul becomes wrongly identified with the body and mind to immense suffering till It extricates Itself from the wrong identification or bondage. The extrication is through the well known reasoning "I am not mind or body but the Soul". Traditionally this process of selfexorcism is one of analysis and elimination as "Not this, not this" till the sovereign state is reached. Jnana process is rooted in dialeetical selfanalysis and practical sieving. (The Gita of course does not adumbrate these technicalities of Jnana).

But the above reasoning is really of the limited mind and not of the Soul which is ever free and omniscient. Now extramental Soul (Abangmanasagochara) is realisable by the Soul alone and not by the poor mind, whose thinking or adoration can give a God which the poor mind is capable of conceiving but not of God as He is beyond the mental cloud. But what really happens is not that the mind thus knows the Soul or Brahman. Thinking about Soul the mind loses its notion of egoistic individuality and thins out gradually (Thus this mentalisation also ultimately leads to mindlessness). Finally Brahmahood emerges on full extinction of the mind. But this is really like the Sun overcoming the Moon, for such emasculation and extinction of the mind is really caused by the Soul. This self-expression of Soul buries all agnosticism about Soul or God.

When the Jnanis attain the status of mindless Brahmahood (Jnanis do not want to see any God) they become incapable of functioning as man. At that stage the Jnanis get the sense of "Soham" or I am He which is like I am that I am of Judaism). For this non-personal sense of Soham extinction of personal desires is the essential prerequisite. But some mental stilthiness without full demindisation is often mistaken as Samadhi or attainment of Brahmahood. The mind goes only when the Soul is up and assertive and if the mind goes permanently man has no rebirth just as the paddy has no rebirth if its husk is gone.

38. Like Yoga the orthodox Jnana path also is strewn with many theories. Sankhya and Vedanta are more important amongst them. Both uphold the Vedic contention of the Soul being absolute, unattributed, uncreated and uncreating. But in man both find It bound down as it were. To explain this dichotomous Sankhya says that another force called Prakriti creates the world and binds the Soul in each man, while monistic Vedanta says that there is no creation by anybody and Soul's so called bondage in man is due to an unscrutable Maya or illusion. On the point of salvation Sankhya holds that Soul's ultimate discretion (Viveka) that Prakriti is playing the game, not It, brings, Soul's salvation, while Vedanta holds that Soul's disillusionment about Its human individuality restores It to Its prestine state, there being no absolute Prakriti. (See para 19).

But the theories are discursive and contradictory. Their fundamental contradiction has arisen out of the hypothesis that Brahman is always Nirgun or attributeless and inactive. But in fact like the leafy and non-leafy stages of the deciduous Banyan tree Brahman is Sagun and Nirgun both. It is unattributed and noncreating it Its Nonmanifest stage but attributed and creating in Its Individual stage. Once this is known the absurd suppositions of Maya (by Vedanta) and separate Prakriti (by Sankhya) become unnecessary to explain this world. The fact is that Soul or God in Its individual stage projects this world through Its selfcreated mind.

The immortal Soul does not really lose Its blissful universal character at the stage of individuality of creatures. There because of the projection of the mind the Soul (like a folded umbrella) appears limited. Universal Soul turns into so called Individual Soul in association with Its selfprojected individual mind and again shines in its free universality after withdrawing or suppressing the mind. This is somewhat like universal space becoming the limited house space through house walls and again becoming universal space through dismantling of those walls ? (See paras 16 & 20).

Sankhya and Vedanta both underrate the power of Soul or God. Soul or Brahman has really no illusion or indiscretion. He is ever conscious of His human play and independently projects or withdraws it. In the human stage two personalities are practically created, the limited mental personality and the Soul personality as the overlord of mental personality. Just as the joys and sorrows of the playing child are not the joys and sorrows of his accompanying father, similarly the joys and sorrows of individuality are really of the projected mind (which is a kind of semi-sensible ray of the Soul and incapable of existing or suffering and enjoying without the Soul) and not of the accompanying Soul, though the Soul is quite conscious of those states of the mind. This is perhaps indicated by the Upanishadic parable of the two birds on the same tree, one (mind) eating and the other (Soul) not eating the fruits. Bondage and liberation of the Soul are two strong words here. The true position is like our wilful wearing and unwearing of dress.

This incidentally clears the Sankhya theory of plurality of Souls. Sankhya holds that Souls are innumerable because on the redemption of one Soul other Souls remain bound. (If so whence are Souls multiplying with multiplication of population?) But like different leaves of the same tree different individuals are only different mental personalities on the same universal Soul. In salvation these mental personalities go one by one and the universal Soul stands dissociated from these impermanent limited minds. So on the salvation of one individual other individuals may remain bound to the human drama.

39. Then to turn to the Vedantic objection that sensible Brahman can not be insensible matter and hence this world is all Maya or illusion. But Brahman really does not become insensible matter. Brahman projects the mind and mind creates matter. So this world is not absolute Maya but like a dream is half Maya, being an impermanent product of the impermanent mind, semi-subjective and in form gross and fine both. In this particular way only this socalled material world is Brahman. Thus so called matter has neither a separate existence from Brahman nor from mind.

Subjectivity or objectivity and fineness or grossness of matter are two different concepts. Sankhya no doubt upholds separate existence of Prakriti or matter but Sankhya also holds matter to be gross form of the mind (see para 15). Yoga holds matter to be not only originally fine but subjective as well. Matter is mind-born but mind is a projection of the Soul or Self. The mind is a glow not of the brain but of the Soul. As such matter is successive transformation and semi-subjective. This way the whole material world can be called a subjective modification of the Non-manifest which is the root cause of this world tree.

The position is very enigmatic. What Yogic light reveals is that in the fuller absolute state there is no matter and form or even the fourth dimension of time. The consciousness of mass and momentum which is object (Idam) sprouts after the sense of Ego (Ahang) grows. About the sense of the sound also Yogis say that from Para (Void) sound becomes Pashyanti (mental), then Madhyama (Psychophysical) and finally Baikhari (material). Mass and gravitation are said to be inalienable conditions of matter. But when the mind of the Yogi is considerably up he can rise above automatically. Where then goes his heavy Annamaya Kosh or your law of everything attracting everything ? If the mind of the Yogi is further up on the background of the Soul he retains a freeer nonmaterial abstract individuality only (Monomaya Kosh) and finally if he blots out his mind in full he loses his abstract individuality also. Before Vedanta Vijnanavada of Buddhism also idealistically suggested the gross form to be an offshoot of the subtle mind. All matter has existence and a quality. But the sense of existence and quality is originally given by the mind (see para 36).

40. This tends to show that gross matter is a mental phantasy without any separate absolute existence of its own.

The mind seems to project mental pictures through lenses of senses and we perceive objects accordingly. All our material experience is only the experience of the virtues of taste, touch etc. through our five senses. These virtues are of and in mind, not outside. If I have four senses to me matter is four propertied only and if I have no sense no matter exists for me. The test of matter lies in its affectations to beings through their skin, eye etc. But that is only a mental work primarily. Thus objects depend on our mental affectations. Outside objects do not create these as is held by western empiricism. (The cinema pictures are not outside on the screen but really in the projector). Mind itself creates these affectations as in a dream. As you feel so you see. This is a grand cosmic masmarism. The whole objective world with the abstractions of succession (Time) coexistence (space) casuality as also feelings and reasonings are nothing but certain mental attitudes and notions. The universal laws of the physical world are nothing but perceptual modes of mental laws and mental views. (Even science is now saying that matter (electron and proton) is only energy and force condensed. From this that matter is mental energy and mental motion as held by Sankhya is only one step farther). Thus there is no object everything is subject, matter being only a mental sensation. And the final hoax is that how the mind will perceive matter (i.e. the so-called objective sensations) is guided by the Soul Itself. Kant also says that what gives material sensation to the mind the mind does not know. For human suffering see paras 19 & 57.

You may say "No, matter separately exists but the mind may or may not see that. Otherwise why I and all others see an object alike ? Yogis do not see any matter only because they lose the perceiving mind." There again it may be said that if matter had such absolute non-subjective existence why should they change with the change of subjective factors, the mental quality ? How to explain hallucination ? Wherefrom comes the yellowness in Jaundice and world whirling in giddiness ? Then you find an object as before because you similarly project your mind as before. And all see an object alike because all minds have a common denominator of certain basic perceptual powers. If you see there a table, I a snake and he a vacuum only, then the intended inter-communication of herd life becomes impossible. After my death when I do not see that table it exists only for those who have a perceiving mind. What about our senses of growth, decay and movement of objects ? They are also mind-born. They change even in the dream stage of the mind. The sense of momentum seems to grow out of our mental agitation. For when Yogi's mind is calmed, he perceives even running carriages stand-still and when his mind is activised into the carriage he finds it moving. Finally if even matter be not mind-born but an outside object, the Yogic plan of withdrawing the mind equally rids one of the trouble accruing from perception of matter.

9TH CHAPTER

PATH OF BHAKTI OR ADORATION

41. The Gita has underscored Bhakti and Karma. So let us notice those two more closely. In kind Bhakti is a mental emotion (within the bounds of Gunas) and is broadbased on the semi-dualism of the creator and the created. It is founded on the primary perception of ordinary mortals, not on the penetrative ontology of the advanced. The ordinary man perceives himself to be a mortal created creature (mental I) and not the immortal almighty Divine (Soul I). He finds that his powers are limited and in his helplessness he naturally assumes another bigger power malign or benign and embodied or disembodied (but anthropomorphic in essence, it being much like the six propertied Bhagavan or God of our common parlance) as his overlord and prays to him (through or without icons or idols) for help.

There is little difference in this between the so called civilised and the uncivilised. Some Austrics have the idea of Mana or Divine Essence permeating all objects and beings and even the whole universe. Though it is decried as unsophisticated Animism, couplet 3.4 of Swateswator Upanishad or 6/7 of the Gita does not say antything higher. Koran's prayer "Show us the straight path", Bible's prayer "Deliver us from Evil" and Upanishadic prayer "From evil lead us to the good' are of the same order. Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism partly are based on Bhakti which has the dualistic tinge of one universal God creating this world.

In outer theory Bhakti is thus semi-dualistic, of the creator and the created, the divine and the nondivine, while orthodox

Jnana is strictly monistic where man is held to be the hypnotised uncreated universal Soul. In Bhakti God is deemed to be the transcendent attributed creator in which way he becomes worshipable (by mental I). But in orthodox Jnana by God is meant the highest unattributed noncreating form of the Supreme in which way he becomes an object of practical knowledge or realisation only and not of any adoration and worship (by the mental ego). Praying to passive unattirbuted God is only the absurdity of saying "You can not and do not do anything but still grant my prayer."

42. But another kind of worship is also possible. It is Soul worship of selfworship, one partner of man (mind) praying to its other partner (Soul). And Jnanis also can do it reasonably. Only their barring idea of Soul being unattributed and noncreating has to be changed to one of Soul being attributed and creating. The Soul actually projecting the mind for the individual play, the actual relationship between the Soul part and the mind part of man is the relationship between father and son, one more powerful than the other. The Soul that lies in the body and guides man's mind is the so called Individual Soul and man's immediate concern is not with the passive Nonmanifest Soul but with this creating Individual Soul with which Yogis do have talks even. No man can at once go to the Nonmanifest Soul over the authority of the active Individual Soul. So even for Jnanis recognition of or prayer to the attributed Individual Soul is quite appropriate and expedient. This Individual Soul is in fact the creating Iswar or God of Bhakti. The contemplative Jnanis also can desirably change their notion of "I am passive Soul" into "I am active Soul". Only this way can Sankhya, Vedanta and Bhakti meet together. (Some bow down to Soul or God with suspended breath without any desire or prayer. That is partial mind suspension and as such more Yoga than Bhakti). Even according to couplet 61/18 of the Gita the dancing mind of man may pray to his inlying dancer, the Soul. In Shakta appeal of "Jagirihi Mahamaya" (Great power arise in me) and the Upanishadic appeal of "Aviravirma Adhi" (Truth reveal thyself in me) the prayer is to the inlying power of the man himself (and as such more confident) and not to any outside creator for his pity. Anyone may pray to his inner power for ending the mental ills. In fact pursuing God more closely many confidently assert, "My God is not an unrelated outsider, but the great Soul in me."

43. Bhakti serves as a great spiritual lever in direct and indirect ways. Its indirect service will be evident from the following. Man is mind-associated Soul and his salvation is in being mind-dissociated (Swarupya of 15/6). The main business in spiritual practices is mind purging an undoing the sense of egoism with full identification with the mind, for otherwise immortal universalisation can not be attained. Now surrender of the devout Bhakta to God helps to weaken his egoism considerably. Bhakti and egoistic self-indulgence are naturally antithetical (55/11). A real surrendering Bhakta is bound to establish sovereignty of God in his life to proportionate cut of his former egoism. Thus Bhakti helps to attenuate egoistic excesses with their attendant mental distractions. This emasculation of egoism helps the Bhakta ultimately to knock out the enfeebled mind more easily. It is because of this chastening effect on the mind that Bhakti also is seen to raise Kundalini and give Samadhi. This mind mutation is the common meeting ground of all the spititual paths.

44. Now to come to the direct way. Is Bhakta's appeal to God merely selfdeception without earning anything for him ? (Here unlike couplet 22/13 the affilicted and the appellant is the mind of course). Is not the praying also seen to suffer helplessly ? Now God or Soul and mind are closely connected, the first projecting the second for the individual play. If mind's appeal be very earnest, it is certain to be felt by the sovereign Soul. (Bhakti is not western Deism). Higher Bhaktas can have even dialogue with the worshipped. (Here is a practical example. On severe death thrust the mind of a devotee made a grievance of it. There Soul's reply was, "What could it do, I was there"). In our advanced state God is not merely an assumed Reality but a directly perceived one to evaporation of atheism and attainment of a higher bliss. See para 20. At a high stage when the mind of the Bhakta is more purged more consanguinity is established between the Soul and the mind (in fact even at the stages of Dharana and Dhyana also aspirants retain a thin mental personality) and Bhakta's love for God or Soul becomes more natural or Ahuitaki as in case of parents and children. Then the ordinary woes of life can not touch the Bhakta so much. As the mind of the Bhakta becomes purer through adoration he automatically gets higher peace. If the mind cries, the Soul responds.

But this is not to say that all prayers automatically attain success. There are two handicaps there. If the prayer be antagonistic to the God-intended play of individuality, it is neither allowed to be intense, nor is granted. Again in the higher stage of the mind will power itself is lost to consequent preclusion of any prayer. There is no question of mental earnestness there. Any way Bhakta's surrender to God serves as a great consolation to him and then he dislikes the idea of Soham even. Here the great weighty point is that real earnest Bhakti is a divine emotion and is really generated by the Soul (not so much by the mind) for ultimate mental death and liberation. (Samipya, Sayujya and Sarupya or Salokya come gradually).

45. Dualistic Bhakti of the worshipper and the worshipped does not give the worshipper immortality and the highest bliss and beatitude. However from this high state of the penultimate there may be an easy lift into the immortal ultimate of the Absolute. By complete selfsurrender the thin mental personality of the Bhakta may be easily effaced to his universalisation. In this connection there is a pertinent Bhakti saying like this—"When I see Him I lose my personality and when I am in my personality I do not see Him." In slokas 72/2 and 4/15 the Gita also appreciates such universalisation (Patanjal Darshan also says that Samadhi can be attained by devotion to God) beyond individuality but holds that it is possible in Bhakti also through the *grace of God* (55, 16/18). By this as also by 16/8 the Gita however scuttles the ordinary Bhakti concept of eternal duality of the worshipper and the worshipped. That will of the Absolute is of course a weighty point which holds good for success in all spiritual paths, for it is the Absolute who is playing in the world stage and in the upper reaches where there is no mental volition He alone is the pilot.

Bhakti may be Sattwik or Non-Sattwik. prayers may be high or low. In some cases in the higher Sattwik stage Bhakta's (mental I) desire of contact with the worshipped becomes acute. But mere seeing and hearing the Diety eternally is a higher sattwik bondage only. In this connection the Chhandogya Upanishad says. "Where a man sees, hears and knows that *which is other than himself is finite*. The Infinite is immortal. the finite is mortal." In aphorism 28/3 Sankhya also says that such "dualistic object of worship is merely phenomenal and illusory."

Some Bhaktas are chary of universalisation. "I want to taste sugar and not be sugar" is their slogan. They mistake Satchitananda to be senseless like sugar. Extramental Brahmananda is much higher than the mental Ananda of the Bhakta, the degree of this Ananda or ecstasy bearing a ratio to the degree of sublimation of the mind. When Kabir attained universality and Bramananda, he stopped dualistic Kirtan and its lower Ananda. Anyway without attaining mindless universalisation the Bhaktas can not avoid the pangs of death (ordinarily the suffering of a moment of death outweighing all the raptures of life) though those may be less affiicting in case of higher Bhaktas.

46. Rising to the extramental plane one can become God. But one can not truly know God from the individual mental plane below (25/2). The sensing of God by higher minds is merely like seeing the cake without eating it, for the mind does not enjoy blissful immortality thereby. As an entity of limited power the mind can never have full sense of unlimited God or Soul as He really is. (see para 20).

The *Biswarup Darshan* of chapter 11 of the Gita is allegorically unrolling the visible phenomenal world with all its exits and entrances. Still it has been solemnised as the "Avya Rupa" or absolute transcendental vision (4/11) which really has no form or such duality of the seer and the seen. (In Mahabharata also there is another exhibition of Biswarup by Krishna, when Dhritarshatra refused to bind Duryodhana according to the instruction of Krishna). Patanjal Darshan by aphorism 35/1 says that if the mind is concentrated on the skull unusual sights are seen. But that is no realisation of the absolute plane.

But contrary to the earlier abstract picture of the Absolute (25/2, 24/7, 55/18, 39/10 unlike 35/4, 29/6) with poetic rhapsody God here is depicted as a many-armed many-footed superman with the Sun and the Moon (not the stars who are bigger still) as his eyes and eating man with his protruded mouths, but worshipped by many classes of semi-supermen. Arjuna was shown a host of queer creatures as well. (This is reminiscent of the cosmic vision of Purusha Sukta of Rig Veda where the Purusha is said to be thousand-headed thousand-eyed and thousand-footed. Mundaka Upanishad also similarly posits that the cosmic person has fire as his head, the Sun and the Moon as his eyes and the quarters as his ears etc. though again you find in the Upanishad itself that in the absolute plane the Sun does not heat and the Moon does not shine). The shower Krishna is here four-armed himself (46/11).

There may be a lower stage when one can see the whole cosmic scene. Buddha is said to have seen the whole cosmic picture before attaining full Buddhahood. That may be a stage below the Avya or Absolute stage which is a mindless and attributeless void only. Is it merely the vision of what is called Hiranyagarva or the totality of abstract mental personalities or the Thought Samadhi of Sankhya 29/3 when due to concentrated thought the whole form of Prakriti is reflected in Purusha ? But it is disavowed to be Moksha or liberation nor is it communicable to others. Sankhya, Vedanta and Yoga all deny such a phenomenal world in the Absolute state. The Gita here betrays a tinge of cosmism or pantheism rather than acosmism or transcendental Absolutism to which Arjuna was supposed to have been lifted. It is intriguing that in the Absolute plane also Arjuna should have such a duality of the seer and the seen. Arjuna had a beatific vision but Sanjoy described this without such a vision or intuition. Yogic perception of the mindfree Absolute plane disavows (like Brahma Sutra 1-2-3) any such objectivity and multiplicity. What then the Yogi actualises is not that he is in all things and beings, but that he alone exists as the sole impersonal Universal and no emperical phenomenon (animals and objects or Krishna) exists to the possibility of such devouring of anybody by anybody, death being a chimera of the lower mental plane. The whole world with its woes and sensations disappears with the withdrawal of the mind and reappears with the projection of the mind, perception of things and beings changing with the colour and quality of the mind. (see para 39).

10TH CHAPTER

THE PATH OF KARMA OR ACTIVITY

47. Nishkam Karma or dispassionate work is perhaps the most dominant trait of the Gita. Hindu philosophy generally disdains work (ritualistic or otherwise) as a distracting egoistic handicap in salvation. To exonerate work of that stigma the theory of dispassionate work has been held out by the Gita. The Gita has even baptised it as a Yoga. Traditional Yoga is inhibition of the mind (chitta vritti nirodha). But the Gita has called this "work tact" (Karmasu Kausalam) as Yoga. But there the Gita has opened a Pandora's box.

The intriguing points are, how far Nishkam Karma is practicable and whether it is independently capable of giving salvation (51/2). Now like ethical duty of the west Nishkam Karma is duty for duty's sake. But there the eternal enigma of how to determine duty remains unsolved. (The postulate of "Samyak Karma" or proper work of Jainism and Buddhism is a vague proposition). One may be induced to a Kuruksetra for earthly possession or for fighter's glory as held by the Gita. In any fix Gita's advice (25/16) is to depend on the judgement of the scriptures. But the interpretative finding whether a particular duty has been so enjoined ultimately remains with the imperfect mind of the doer. Scriptures are also conflicting (3/18). Therefore Vishma and Arjuna had conflicting views about the propriety of the Kurukshetra fight. There one could also think that for the blindness of Dhritarash'ra Pandu ruled only as his Regent and the son of the original king and not of the Regent should succeed. About the kind of the fight also there might be difference of opinion—Satyagraha or violent fight ?

48. Then supposing that duty is ascertainable, what its disinterested discharge can give ? The main point in salvation being inhibition of the mind and the mental ego, the value of Nishkam Karma is judgable by how far it advances mental inhibition. There it is found that though it may arrest mental degradation, it can not eliminate all mental distractions, nor blot out the ego. That way it is difficult to defend Nishkam Karma as a Karma Yoga, simply because it does not liquidate the mind and the ego in full without which liberation is impossible.

49. To get rid of the mental rot involved (48/18) in work (here remember the "Ghati Karma" of Jainism) the Gita has suggested two work tacts, one is (in Sankhya way) assuming the idea that Prakriti is doing the work, not I (27/3 ; 8, 9, 14/5) and the other is doing work without attachment (30/3). But the knot of individuality can not be untied without undoing the mind first and undoing the mind means cessation of all work, work being mind-based. Thus for salvation what is necessary is control of the work of Prakriti or mind. But couplets 27, 33/3, 14/5 etc. give a free licence to Prakriti. This is only encouraging egosim to frustration of emancipation.

50. As a giver of salvation the Gita seems to have made a confusion between being Nishkam and doing Nishkam work. The former (which is really Vairagya or indifference) can give

salvation, the latter can not. Like a high class Yogi if you be desireless not only about higher Kam of doing public service but about your individual existence also, demindisation and absolutisation follow consequently. (Isopanishad also supports this contention.) The point of Nishkam Karma does not arise there. It arises when you want to retain your individual existence and mind. That shows the lower scope of Nishkam Karma which is not an immediate earner of salvation.

51. Then in work being dedicated to God and also relegated to Prakriti man has been confusedly viewed in two roles—mental self and soul self. Conceiving man as a mental personality all his work has been required to be dedicated to God (57/18). This is mental I's surrender to God in work also. Thus it is a work form of Bhakti and not so much an independent path. God-mindedness is an essential prerequisite here. This dedication aspect has a noble purging effect on work no doubt. But soon man has been conceived as a Soul personality also and all work has been held to be of Prakriti and not his. The dedication aspect is cancelled by the stand of 27/3, 14/5 that Prakriti is doing the work. If the work is not of Soul or Purusha what is the good of dedicating it? And Soul I being God to what other God can It dedicate? Then this dedication debars Jnanis and Yogis to do any Nishkam Karma, for they have no extra God to submit their work to. But they also stand wedded to Nishkam or Sattwik Karma at the start of their practices (11/18). Nishkam or Sattwik Karma is an inescapable factor for the beginners of all the paths when some Karma can not be helped, for Karma is the very law of (lower) life. The Gita itself while holding that the self-controlled has no work (17/3, 6/12) allows activity for the unsophisticated (26/3, 3/6) and finally holds work as essential (5/3, 9/5, 17/6, 11/18). The selfdenying passivity of 45/2 seems to be against the spirit of Nishkam Karma (47/2, 9/18).

52. The main nuillity of Nishkam Karma is here. It is obvious that all works require mental activisation, mental thinking feeling and willing. These capacities and virtues are held to be Gunas or mental powers and qualities. Thus all work is Guna-stained (48/18) and performable when one is within the Gunas and unperformable when he is beyond the Gunas (19/11). Sankhya's Purusha is attributeless and as such workless also. Now in so-called Nishkam Karma also at least Sattwik or nobler attributes do remain (26/18) and as such it is still

oaming in the realm of Gunas which is held to be the binding affectation for individuals (19/18). Elsewhere the Gita itself postulates that selfless work is Sattwik Karma (23/18) but liberation is beyond Sattwa Guna (20/14). Thus in liberation Nishkam Karma cannot deliver the goods. Gita's claim is self-contradictory and euphemistic.

53. Again if a work is motivated how can it be Nishkam? But dedication or no dedication, all work is mind-bound and motivated. All work violent or non-violent have two parts, the general motive and will and secondly execution. In execution part also there is a motive (with some Vairagya the general motive may be less selfish and banal only). At Kuruksetra if Arjun had no executional motive why should he kill his grandfather instead of killing his brother Yudhisthir or simply playing dice ?

Over this there is another executional distraction in planning and fighting the war. Whatever the paper theory, look at the mental excitement that Arjuna (despite his claimed Brahma Jnan—73/18) and Krishna had in the actual fighting. Here passive resistance or Satyagraha was rather more helpful in retaining the required nonagitational state of the mind. Gita's assumption is that in the conventional Karma bondage only moral distraction is involved. But no, physical distraction is also involved there. Mind being the mover of the body, where there is physical agitation there is equal mental agitation also. Physical work and exertion thus impede mental calming which is necessary for liberation. (Even outer social unrest is not removable without this mental calm of individuals). Even if the physical work be normally innocent, still it obstructs mental calming. To temporarily arrest his mental calming a Yogi was doing the innocent work of throwing pelts on floating straws. With spiritual uplift the capacity of doing any work of the Nishkam variety even disappears. As the mind rises it perfers and is even forced to physical stilthiness.

54. The Gita has made a confusion of stages with regard to Nishkam Karma. It is no doubt strategic in the lower stage of individuals but in their higher stage it is a back drag and even impracticable. The suitability of instruments varies with stages. The Gita is that way correct when unlike (5-8/3) it says that the selfcontrolled has no work (18/3, 19/4) but such Jnanis are asked not to preach that high ideal to commoners (26, 29/3). Jest and capability in work returns when the mind

of the Yogi is down again. And if the mind is work-engrossed it becomes difficult to raise it. Mukti and any Karma thus become antagonistic in the higher sphere (3/6). Hence the stricture of even Sattwik Karma by Indian Shastras (mind 26/3, 3/6, 3/18). In repudiation of this contention King Janaka is cited (20/3). But no, while doing state duty or begetting Sita, Urmila, Mandabika and Srutakritti Janaka could not be in Samadhi or near about it. In Yogic state of sloka 20/6 no Karma is possible. Shastras truly hold that on the rise of Brahma Jnana duty and non-duty ceases to exist (17/3). Buddhism also says that higher Pratyag Budda's who are about to get Nirvana have no work ; public service applies to lower Budhisattawas only.

55. Gita's Nishkam Karma is nothing but the old *Sattwik Karma* of Hindu tradition, old wine in new bottle. Its cardinal point is doing personal and social duty (20/3) complacently without being swayed by lower impulses. The Gita itself says that the best workers are Sattwik (10, 23, 16/18). Hindu treatises call Anasakta and Anavisanga work as Sattwik Karma and hold that also as bondage. Like Sankhya (85/1) the Gita also affirms that the bondage of Karma is not fully undone by Nishkam Karma and that all Karma has some pollution and defilement (48/18). But it is certainly a help in the lower stage. And the Gita also holds that Nishkam Karma is for the unadvanced and the weak (26-29/3, 3/6, 11/12). The theory that Nishkam Karma is performable by the selfrealised (42/4) is clearly against this stand of Nishkam Karma being intended for the neophyte only. If Nishkam Karma is performable by the self-realised only (as a play work) Nishkam Karma loses its value as an independent giver of salvation for the lowly. Gradual worklessness is the natural and unavoidable sequence in spiritual salvation. The working householder must get into workless Vanaprastha, but this workless condition can be had under the family roof even. Family men even may attain happy Samadhi.

56. Nishkam Karma becomes a hoax if in Gita's own way it is judged in the light of the absolute plane, namely preemtive lack of free will and initiative. The Gita itself throws out its case of Nishkam Karma by saying that partial force of God attracts the mind and senses for enjoyment (7/15) and virtue and vice come from God (5/10) and that man is not a free agent (61/18) and that Prakriti is doing the work (27/3, 8-9/5, 29/13) and not the real man.

57. Then the fundamental truth is that without full depersonalisation even calming of the mind (incon inence, avarice, anger etc. are sin only because they agitate the mind) can not pluck real salvation and a feeling of repugnance with individuality is the precondition of this depersonalisation. But the author of this deindividualisation is the Soul and not the mind which can not be even calmed without Soul's intention and authority (33-35/3). As the tree grows, ripens and finally sheds its leaves, so the Soul grows ripens and finally sheds the mind. The Soul creates the passions and dispassions of the mind according to the need of Its play. Since practically there is nothing in the world except Soul or God, the so called evil is also God-intended (4-5/10). Is one life possible without killing another life lying in plants and animals ? Even the enjoyments of this life are under Soul's sovereignty. The mind has limited authority in this. It is like the grazing cow with its neck rope with the cow boy. The mind has of course the right of crying on pinpricks.

But what about the evident force of Purushakar or self-effort which is said to even shape fate conceived as the resultant force of one's free work in previous lives? But really one's present life and its works are only the unfinished parts of his whole inter-life drama of flowering liberation from the bud stage (14/5) and God or Soul is the determiner of the whole drama so that his Purushakar or self-exertion is only what God makes him do through his ego for the fulfilment of the rest of the drama.

58. What is teleological purpose of life ? It seems to be a mental feast, varied mental experience with smiles and tears not only in different ages of the same life but in different lives in one cycle uptill redemption. Hence a child does not get redemption though now morally so innocent. Actually also after considerable enjoyment satiety is seen to arise, at times even in the midst of wildest enjoyments. Does it not then scotch the conventional idea of Karma sequence that good or bad deeds produce good or bad effects ?

But the mind has limited autonomy and the consequence of its own work is also similarly limited. It can not be absolute to frustration of Soul's overall plan. The lag of over indulgence, distraction and decentralisation (from Soul) is covered by suffering, prayer, recalming and recentralisation. The theory of inexorable Karma chain liquidates God and absurdly makes Karma the arbiter. This Karma is mental fancy no doubt. But has God abdicated in favour of Karma or the mind ? Because of Soul's ultimate control of the mind that enjoyment will eternally inflame further enjoyments as held by Bhagavat (14-19-9) does not turn true, for in that case the whole world would go on deadening and deadening. The theory of inevitability of Prarabdha or current work and all consuming Brahma Jnan (37/4, 19/5, 24/13 also does not support Bhagavat here. Often in so called bad lives also inexplicably self-enthused Kundalini is found to rise to mental extinction and final emancipation.

If so, does it not cut at the root of human morality ? It cuts the root of full free will of man but not all moral incentives of humanity. For those who are in the uptream of progress can not but go in for morality just as those who are in downstream can not but fight shy of it. But who will practise what how long depends on the will of the Soul which creates the necessary Tyag-Vairagya (renunciation and detachment) of the mind in ripe time. Just as every bud is destined to bloom in its own time, so every individual is destined to attain salvation today or tomorrow after his set play in this long inter-life drama. (If one life's Karma produced further life there would be no end of further life).

I.M.H. PRESS PVT. LTD., DELHI